

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING

2445 M STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037-1420

TELEPHONE (202) 663-6000
FACSIMILE (202) 663-6363

STUART P. GREEN
DIRECT LINE (202)
663-6693
INTERNET SGREEN@WILMER.COM

4 CARLTON GARDENS
LONDON SW1Y 5AA
TELEPHONE 011 (4471) 839-4466
FACSIMILE 011 (4471) 839-3537

RUE DE LA LOI 15 WETSTRAAT
B-1040 BRUSSELS
TELEPHONE 011 (322) 231-0903
FACSIMILE 011 (322) 230-4322

FRIEDRICHSTRASSE 95
BRIEFKASTEN 29
D-10117 BERLIN
TELEPHONE 011 (4930) 2643-3601
FACSIMILE 011 (4930) 2643-3630

July 29, 1994

William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: CS Docket No. 94-48

Dear Mr. Caton:

Enclosed for filing please find an original plus four copies of Reply Comments of ValueVision International, Inc. in the above-referenced Docket in response to the Notice of Inquiry released May 19, 1994.

Sincerely,



Stuart P. Green

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

0+4

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUL 29 1994

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of

Implementation of Sections of
the Cable Television Consumer
Protection and Competition Act
of 1992

Annual Assessment of the Status
of Competition in the Market for
the Delivery of Video Programming

CS Docket 94-48

To: The Commission

REPLY COMMENTS OF VALUEVISION INTERNATIONAL, INC.

VALUEVISION INTERNATIONAL, INC.

William R. Richardson, Jr.
Stuart P. Green

WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING
2445 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 663-6000

Its Attorneys

July 29, 1994

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Summary	ii
Introduction	1
I. THE COMMENTS FILED BY NCTA AND THE CABLE OPERATORS FAIL TO ADDRESS THE COMPETITIVE ISSUES ABOUT WHICH THE COMMISSION HAS REQUESTED INFORMATION	4
II. UNDER THE COMMISSION'S IMPLICIT FEE MODEL FOR LEASED ACCESS, UNAFFILIATED PROGRAMMERS SUCH AS VALUEVISION HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVELY DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN A CARRIAGE OUTLET	7

Summary

In connection with its statutory obligation to report annually to Congress on the "status of competition in the market for the delivery of video programming," the Commission has issued a Notice of Inquiry ("NOI"), requesting comments that consider "whether the anticompetitive conduct, as identified in the 1990 Report and in the legislative history to the 1992 Cable Act, has abated." NOI ¶ 73. The Commission has also asked for specific comments on, among other things, whether "leased access [has] provided a carriage outlet for programming services unable to secure carriage on an MSO's system?" Id. at ¶ 63(a).

Rather than addressing these issues, the comments filed by NCTA and leading MSOs contain mostly abstract statements regarding the supposed virtues of vertical integration and not a single word regarding leased access. Such statements ignore the contrary findings of Congress and, most recently, the Supreme Court. Notwithstanding the intent of Congress in enacting the Cable Act, unaffiliated programmers like ValueVision -- the principal competitor to QVC and HSN -- have found it increasingly difficult to obtain commercial leased access.

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
JUL 29 1994
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of)

Implementation of Sections of)
the Cable Television Consumer)
Protection and Competition Act)
of 1992)

CS Docket 94-48

Annual Assessment of the Status)
of Competition in the Market for)
the Delivery of Video Programming)

To: The Commission

REPLY COMMENTS OF VALUEVISION INTERNATIONAL, INC.

These reply comments are submitted on behalf of ValueVision International, Inc. ("ValueVision") in response to the Notice of Inquiry ("NOI"), FCC 94-119, released May 19, 1994, in the above-captioned proceeding.

Introduction

ValueVision is a television home shopping network which began operation in October 1991.^{1/} It is the principal competitor to QVC and HSN, the other existing home shopping programmers which both dominate the industry and are

^{1/} For a more extensive discussion of ValueVision's service, see Reply Comments of ValueVision International, Inc., MM Docket No. 93-8, filed April 27, 1993.

significantly owned by the MSOs.^{2/} ValueVision's substantial difficulties in obtaining access to those cable systems with significant ownership interests in QVC and HSN make it well situated to comment on "the status of competition in the market for the delivery of video programming." NOI ¶ 1, quoting 47 U.S.C. § 548(g).

QVC and HSN are, to a considerable degree, commonly owned. Seventy percent of the voting stock (and forty percent of the equity) in HSN is controlled by Liberty Media, Inc. ("Liberty"), a TCI spinoff now in the process of being reabsorbed by TCI.^{3/} TCI, which recently announced a new affiliation agreement with HSN,^{4/} currently controls cable systems servicing over 10.2 million subscribers.^{5/} Liberty also currently owns 19

^{2/} QVC had \$1.22 billion net revenues last year and currently serves 46.5 million full time equivalent ("FTE") homes. QVC, SEC Filing 10-K, April 20, 1994, at 5. It recently introduced Q-2, a new home shopping network to which affiliated MSOs are required to commit for ten years. See John M. Higgins & Richard Katz, Money Talks: Cash Offer Gets Startup Q2 Carriage, Multichannel News, April 11, 1994, at 3. HSN had \$1.05 billion in net annual sales and serves 34 million homes. Home Shopping Network, Inc. 1993 Annual Report at 37. In contrast, ValueVision had only \$37 million in annual sales and serves 5.5 million FTE homes.

^{3/} United States v. Tele-Communications, Inc., Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement, 59 Fed. Reg. 24723, 24725 (May 12, 1994); Geraldine Fabrikant, Comcast Gets a Lift in QVC Bid, N.Y. Times, July 22, 1994, at D1.

^{4/} 14 Communications Daily, May 20, 1994, at 6.

^{5/} 59 Fed. Reg. at 24725.

percent of QVC,^{6/} which recently introduced its Q-2 home shopping network -- to which affiliated MSOs are required to commit for a period of ten years.^{7/} Comcast, soon to become the nation's third largest cable operator,^{8/} currently owns 15 percent of QVC.^{9/} Other major MSOs with equity interests in QVC include Cox Enterprises and Viacom Cable.^{10/}

Having sought to obtain, within the last sixteen months, leased access from a wide variety of the leading MSOs, ValueVision has a wealth of experience with which to provide "specific information or examples" in response to the Commission's following question: "Has leased access provided a carriage outlet for programming services unable to secure carriage on an MSO's system?" NOI at ¶ 62(a).

^{6/} SEC Schedule SC 13D/A with respect to QVC Network Inc., filed by Liberty Media Corp. on July 22, 1994; Fabrikant, id. at D1.

^{7/} See Higgins & Katz, supra note 2, at 3.

^{8/} Comcast will become the third largest MSO after its recent agreement to acquire the cable systems of MacLean Hunter. Following this acquisition, Comcast will control cable systems serving more than 3.5 million subscribers. Clustering Is Key; Comcast's \$1.27 Billion Bid is Tops for MacLean Hunter Systems, Communications Daily, June 21, 1994, at 1.

^{9/} Under the latest proposal, Comcast would own 57.5 percent of QVC and Liberty would own 42.5 percent. See Fabrikant at id.; SEC Schedule SC 13D/A with respect to QVC Network Inc., filed by Liberty Media Corp. on July 22, 1994.

^{10/} Id. at 12.

I. THE COMMENTS FILED BY NCTA AND THE CABLE OPERATORS
FAIL TO ADDRESS THE COMPETITIVE ISSUES ABOUT WHICH THE
COMMISSION HAS REQUESTED INFORMATION

The NOI requests information on "whether the anticompetitive conduct, as identified in the [Commission's 1990 Cable Report to Congress] and in the legislative history to the 1992 Cable Act, has abated," and asks that such comments be supported by "specific information [and] examples." NOI ¶ 73. Instead of providing any such examples, commenters such as NCTA devote most of their energy to denying the obvious competitive problems with bottleneck monopolies -- problems recognized by Congress in the 1992 Cable Act^{11/} and by the Supreme Court in the recent "must carry" case.^{12/} And these commenters decline

^{11/} See Cable Act at § 2(a)(5).

^{12/} See Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC, No. 93-44 (U.S. June 27, 1994), slip op. at 32:

When an individual subscribes to cable, the physical connection between the television set and the cable network gives the cable operator bottleneck, or gatekeeper, control over most (if not all) of the television programming that is channeled into the subscriber's home. Hence, simply by virtue of its ownership of the essential pathway for cable speech, a cable operator can prevent its subscribers from obtaining access to programming it chooses to exclude. A cable operator, unlike speakers in other media, can thus silence the voice of competing speakers with the mere flick of the switch.

(footnote omitted.) See also id. at 3 (Stevens, J., concurring) ("It is also clear that cable operators--particularly (but not exclusively) those affiliated with cable programmers--have both the ability and the economic incentive to exploit their gatekeeper status").

entirely to address the serious problems of access under the Commission's commercial leased access rules.

One MSO seems to suggest that the competitive problems in the cable industry that Congress and the Commission have sought to address would somehow all go away if only the Commission would define the market more broadly. See TWC Comments at 16-24.^{13/} And NCTA, et al., argue, in effect, that, with respect to issues of vertical integration, there was no need for the Cable Act in the first place. See NCTA Comments at 22 (quoting B. Klein, The Competitive Consequences of Vertical Integration in the Cable Industry, June 1989, at 3 (pre-Cable Act study which found "'no evidence that vertically integrated MSOs systematically exclude programming networks in which they do not have ownership interests'").

Both Congress and the Commission have since concluded, however, precisely the opposite. As the Commission noted, MSOs have reduced incentives to provide access "when a particular program supplier's offering provides programming . . . [that] competes with a program service already being provided by that

^{13/} The comments of another MSO include as an attachment an economic study that addresses the supposed theoretical benefits of vertical integration. See Charles River Associates, Inc., An Economic Analysis of the FCC's Proposed Cable Ownership Restrictions (Feb. 9, 1993) at 23, 28 ("vertical integration between MSOs and cable program services can lower costs"; "an MSO that owns a program service will not always have the ability to disadvantage rival program services") (emphasis added) (attached to comments of TCI).

cable system." Competition, Rate Deregulation and the Commission's Policies Relating to the Provision of the Cable Television Service, 5 FCC Rcd 4962, 5047 (1990). And as Congress found: "[Vertically integrated] cable operators have the incentive and ability to favor their affiliated programmers. This could make it more difficult for noncable-affiliated programmers to secure carriage on cable systems." 1992 Cable Act, § 2(a)(5).^{14/}

In any event, the Commission has not asked for a general dissertation on whether the Cable Act was a good idea. Instead, it has asked for evidence regarding the actual competitive effects of vertical integration by cable operators and, in particular, the effects of commercial leased access on

^{14/} NCTA cites a number of cases in which unaffiliated cable programmers were allegedly able to obtain carriage on vertically integrated MSOs. NCTA Comments at 23. But NCTA avoids the crucial question of the extent to which there is direct competition between the programming offered by the unaffiliated cable network and that offered by the vertically integrated MSO.

The fact is that where the programming of unaffiliated cable networks is in competition with programming offered by vertically integrated MSOs, such MSOs have typically attempted to block carriage access. In 1990, for example, the FCC drew attention to TCI's carriage contracts with CNBC, which prohibited CNBC from developing a general news channel that would compete with CNN, of which TCI is a part owner. FCC Focuses on "Fine-Tuning" Cable Regulation, Communications Daily, March 16, 1990, at 1. Similarly, the antitrust complaint filed by Viacom against TCI contains allegations that TCI frequently refuses to carry programming that competes with its own affiliated programming services. Complaint at ¶ 39(2), Viacom Int'l Inc. v. Tele-Communications, Inc., No. 93 Civ. 665 (S.D.N.Y., filed September 23, 1993).

access to cable. The MSO comments lack any substantive discussion of such competitive effects and even a single word on the subject of leased access. As discussed below, this silence speaks volumes.

II. UNDER THE COMMISSION'S IMPLICIT FEE MODEL FOR LEASED ACCESS, UNAFFILIATED PROGRAMMERS SUCH AS VALUEVISION HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVELY DENIED THE OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN A CARRIAGE OUTLET

As noted above, the Commission has asked for comments regarding the following question: "Has leased access provided a carriage outlet for programming services unable to secure carriage on an MSO's system?" NOI at ¶ 62(a). As described in more detail in ValueVision's November 1993 Supplement to Petition for Reconsideration,^{15/} ValueVision wrote to the largest 99 MSOs in April and May 1993 asking for their commercial leased access rates and requesting the opportunity to be considered for leased access carriage. Close to seventy MSOs failed to respond at all.^{16/} Of those that did respond, the general message was that retransmission consent and rate regulation issues would occupy all of their time until the Fall. In light of the value it places on productive relationships within the cable industry, ValueVision agreed to defer further inquiries in this area until

^{15/} A copy of that Supplement is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

^{16/} Cf. 47 C.F.R. § 76.970(e) ("[u]pon request, [cable operators shall provide] a schedule of commercial leased access rates . . . to prospective leased access programmers").

those issues had been resolved. ValueVision thus employed other approaches to distribution throughout the Summer and early Fall of 1993.^{17/}

ValueVision sent out a second round of certified mailings in November 1993. Once again, there were only a limited number of responses, and none of these generated any carriage opportunities for ValueVision.

In May 1994, after the Commission's new rate regulation rules were published, ValueVision wrote again, this time to approximately 58 MSOs with which it either had not been doing business or which had been unresponsive to its inquiries. ValueVision has received several kinds of responses to this inquiry concerning commercial leased access. Twenty five MSOs have failed to respond in any manner to any of ValueVision's mailings. A second group has responded by basically refusing to supply the requested information.

Several MSOs have actually taken refuge in the FCC's rulemaking proceedings by suggesting that any leased access rate negotiation should be "defer[red]" while the FCC's commercial leased access rules are under review. See Exhibit B. This

^{17/} Other MSOs responded by asking for burdensome additional information, demanding a non-refundable deposit before they would provide such rates, or stating that they had neither the time nor the inclination to comply with ValueVision's request. In a handful of cases, the MSOs did supply rates, but, as noted in ValueVision's previously submitted Supplement, these proved to be exorbitant.

stratagem has been coupled with recent attempts to delay those proceedings even further by seeking yet a further round of comments on issues that have already been addressed for over a year.^{18/} Others have claimed to ValueVision -- usually without further explanation -- that information regarding the television systems they operate could be obtained "from any cable television fact book," see Exhibit C; and that no rates would be supplied until ValueVision has provided "information on the products [it] sell[s] . . . [and] a copy of [its] annual report and financial statements," see Exhibit D. The epitome of this strategy was the following: "[W]e don't know if by 'system' you mean a cable system as defined by the Cable Act and FCC Rules and Regulations, or if you are more interested in certain markets." See Exhibit E. Other MSOs, which had earlier failed to respond to mailings from ValueVision, later stated that they are already "fulfilling [the] leased access requirements" with other programmers, see Exhibit F, or have already "committed all of our Leased Access capacity to other programmers," see Exhibit G. In the interim, major MSOs have signed on to long term affiliation agreements for yet a second QVC channel, Q2.^{19/}

^{18/} See Ex Parte Comments of Continental Cablevision, Inc., MM Docket No. 92-266 (July 11, 1994).

^{19/} See supra note 7 and accompanying text.

A final group of MSOs (about twenty) have, as requested, responded with rates.^{20/} But the majority have offered rates so exorbitant that ValueVision could never expect to be able to afford access. These rates, when extrapolated to full-time equivalence, have extended as high as \$.82 per subscriber per month (or \$9.84 per subscriber per year) -- rates that are as much as 1200 percent higher than those negotiated by ValueVision prior to the promulgation of the new rules. In several cases, these rates have amounted to fees of more than \$1.8 million annually (TCI New Jersey and TCI Oakland) and \$2.1 million (Dimension Cable Phoenix).

Nor has ValueVision been alone in having such experiences. Telemiami is an unaffiliated Spanish and Portuguese language cable programmer which had its leased access rates raised by TCI to more than seven and half times what it was paying prior to the promulgation of the Commission's leased access rules. United Broadcasting Corp. d/b/a Telemiami, CSC-366, DA 94-623, released June 13, 1994.^{21/} In granting a

^{20/} Many of these have failed to supply information regarding the number of their subscribers, without which it is, of course, impossible to evaluate the reasonableness of the rate. For purposes of these reply comments, we have used the subscriber information contained in the 1994 Television & Cable Fact Book.

^{21/} Telemiami had entered into a five year agreement with TCI in 1988, under which it agreed to pay TCI \$3,500 per month for leased access. In February 1994, after promulgation of the Commission's rules, TCI announced that it would no longer carry Telemiami's programming unless Telemiami agreed to pay TCI's new leased access rate of \$26,341 per month -- seven and a half times
(continued...)

temporary emergency stay of the leased access rules, and permitting Telemiami to continue paying its former rate pending resolution of the underlying complaint, the Commission emphasized the relevant statutory purpose of the Cable Act (namely, to promote competition in the delivery of video programming). It should be noted that ValueVision and Telemiami are among the very few cable programmers that have even been in a position to seek access under the leased access provisions of the Act.

Given such experiences, an important question must be asked by the Commission: How many cable programmers have been able to obtain leased access since passage of the 1992 Act? Congress was clearly concerned about the possibility that unaffiliated programmers would have difficulty obtaining leased access. Congress determined to impose rate regulation for commercial leased access as a partial solution to this problem, and it required that regulation to be implemented by May 1993. The Commission has recognized, however, that its May 1993 leased access rules are only a "starting point that will need refinement," rather than rules that "comprehensively resolve all the issues potentially involved." 8 FCC Rcd 5631, 5936 (1993). Yet these rules remain in place some fifteen months later, with disturbing effects. Unless the Commission undertakes needed modifications to those rules, it will have no choice but to


^{21/}(...continued)

higher than the old rate and more than 60 percent higher than Telemiami's entire monthly revenues.

report to Congress that commercial leased access is actually in worse shape than it was prior to the 1992 Cable Act.

Respectfully submitted,

VALUEVISION INTERNATIONAL, INC.

By 
William R. Richardson, Jr.
Stuart P. Green

Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
2445 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 663-6000

Its Attorneys

Dated: July 29, 1994

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Stuart P. Green, hereby certify that I have this 29th day of July, 1994, caused to be delivered by first-class mail (except as noted) the foregoing Reply Comments of ValueVision International, Inc. to the persons named on the attached Service List.



Stuart P. Green

SERVICE LIST

Bell Atlantic

Michael E. Glover, Esq.
Betsy L. Anderson, Esq.
Bell Atlantic
1710 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

BellSouth Telecommunications

M. Robert Sutherland, Esq.
Michael A. Tanner, Esq.
BellSouth
4300 Southern Bell Center
675 W. Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30376

Cellular Vision of New York

Michael R. Gardner, Esq.
Charles R. Milkis, Esq.
William J. Gildea, III, Esq.
Suite 710
1150 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20036

Consumer Satellite Systems,
Programmers Clearing House,
and Satellite Receivers, Ltd.

Mark C. Ellison, Esq.
Hardy & Ellison
Suite 100
9306 Old Keene Mill Road
Burke, Virginia 22015

DIRECTV

Gary M. Epstein, Esq.
James H. Barker, Esq.
Latham & Watkins
Suite 1300
1001 Pennsylvania
Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

Federal Communications
Commission *

Chairman Reed E. Hundt
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 814
1919 M Street
Washington, D.C. 20054

* Indicates hand delivery

Commissioner James H. Quello
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 802
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20054

Commissioner Andrew C.
Barrett
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 844
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Rachelle B.
Chong
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 842
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Commissioner Susan Ness
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 832
Washington, D.C. 20554

Meredith Jones, Chief
Cable Services Bureau
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 918
2033 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Merrill Spiegel
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 814
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Maureen O'Connell
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 802
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Lisa B. Smith
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 826
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Jill Luckett
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 844
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Rosalind K. Allen
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 832
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Diane L. Hofbauer
Cable Services Bureau
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 605A
2033 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Nina M. Sandman
Cable Services Bureau
Federal Communications
Commission
Room 502E
M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

GTE Service Corporation

John F. Raposa
GTE Service Corporation
P.O. Box 152092
Irving, Texas 75015-2092

Gail L. Polivy
GTE Service Corporation
Suite 1200
1850 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Home Box Office

Benjamin J. Griffin, Esq.
Marla P. Spindel, Esq.
Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay
1200 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

International Transcription
Service *

International Transcription
Service
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 246
Washington, D.C.

Liberty Cable Company

Henry M. Rivera, Esq.
Jay S. Newman, Esq.
Ginsburg, Feldman and Bress
Suite 800
Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Liberty Media Corporation

Robert L. Hoegle, Esq.
Timothy J. Fitzgibbon, Esq.
Carter, Lebyard, & Milburn
1350 I Street, N.W.
Suite 870
Washington, D.C. 20005

NYNEX Telephone Companies

Edward R. Wholl, Esq.
Campbell L. Ayling, Esq.
NYNEX
120 Bloomingdale Road
White Plains, N.Y. 10605

National Cable Television
Association

Daniel L. Brenner, Esq.
Loretta P. Polk, Esq.
National Cable Television
Association
1724 Mass. Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

National Rural Telecommunications
Cooperative

John B. Richards, Esq.
Keller & Heckman
Suite 500 West
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Primestar Partners

Benjamin J. Griffin, Esq.
Laura Holt Jones, Esq.
Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay
1200 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Satellite Broadcasting &
Communications Association of
America

Andrew R. Paul
Senior Vice President
Government Affairs Satellite
Broadcasting & Communications
Association
Suite 600
225 Reinekers Lane
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Tele-Communications

Michael Hammer, Esq.
Laurence D. Atlas, Esq.
Dan Hunter, Esq.
Willkie, Farr & Gallagher
Three Lafayette Center
Suite 600
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3384

Time Warner Cable

Brian Conboy
Theodore Case Whitehouse
Willkie, Farr & Gallagher
Three Lafayette Center
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert D. Joffe
Cravath, Swaine, & Moore
Worldwide Plaza
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, New York 10019

Turner Broadcasting System

Bruce D. Sokler, Esq.
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,
Glovsky & Popeo
Suite 900
701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2608

United States Satellite
Broadcasting Company

Marvin Rosenberg, Esq.
Patricia A. Mahoney, Esq.
Fletcher, Heald, & Hildreth
11th Floor
1300 N. 17th Street
Arlington, Va. 22209

U S West

James T. Hannon, Esq.
U S West
Suite 700
1020 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Wireless Cable Association
International

Paul J. Sinderbrand, Esq.
William W. Huber, Esq.
Sinderbrand & Alexander
Suite 610
888 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-4103



ALL-STATE LEGAL SUPPLY CO. 1-800-222-0610 EDS11 RECYCLED

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

Nov 23 '93
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
SECRETARY

In the Matter of

Implementation of Sections of
the Cable Television Consumer
Protection and Competition Act
of 1992

Rate Regulation

MM Docket 92-266

To: The Commission

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

ValueVision International, Inc. ("ValueVision").
respectfully requests leave to file the accompanying Supplement
to Petition for Reconsideration in order to document its recent
experience in seeking leased access, following the release of the
Commission's leased commercial access rules in the Report and
Order issued in this docket. 8 FCC Rcd 5631 (1993) ("Report").
ValueVision was unable to include this information in its
petition for reconsideration of the Report or its subsequent
pleadings,^{1/} because the responses to its requests for leased
access were not received until after the pleading cycle had

^{1/} See Petition for Reconsideration of ValueVision
International, Inc., MM Docket No. 92-266 (filed June 21, 1993);
Opposition to Petitions for Reconsideration of ValueVision
International, Inc., MM Docket No. 92-266 (filed July 21, 1993);
and Reply to Oppositions to Petition for Reconsideration of
ValueVision International, Inc., MM Docket No. 92-266 (filed
August 2, 1993).